

REMARKS

Claims remaining in the present application are Claims 1-21.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Greer et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,247,048 (hereinafter Greer) in view of Bennett et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,122,670 (hereinafter Bennett) in further view of Solymar, U.S. Pat. No. 6,244,758 (hereinafter Solymar). The rejection to Claims 1-21 is respectfully traversed for the reasons discussed below.

Claim 1 recites, in part:

said host computer system determining a communication protocol from a plurality of possible communication protocols based on said one transport mechanism used in step a), wherein said determining comprises indexing a table with said one transport mechanism recognized in said b) to determine at least one parameter in the communication protocol, and wherein said table comprises parameters that are designed to improve communication, based on the transport mechanisms;

Claim 1 recites table comprising parameters that are designed to improve communication based on the transport mechanisms. Claim 1 recites that the table is indexed with the transport mechanism being used to determine at least one communication parameter, which allows the embodiment of Claim 1 to use different parameters depending on the transport mechanism.

The rejection asserts that Bennett teaches a protocol logic subsystem that verifies an IP header checksum and sends a datagram over a bus 43, protocol logic 45, bus 49, i900 bridge 407, bus 47, bus interface 37, and PCI bus 40 (see e.g., Fig. 4). However, this disclosure of Bennett does not teach or suggest indexing a table with the mechanism being used to determine a communication parameter, as claimed. For example, Bennett fails to teach or suggest a table that comprises parameters for the various busses, logic, and interface. Further, Bennett does not teach using bus 43 or PCI bus 40, etc. to index a table to determine communication parameters. Therefore, Bennett fails to teach or suggest indexing the table with the transport mechanism, as claimed.

Bennett may teach verifying that the IP header checksum is correct and sending or not sending the datagram based on the verifying. However, this teaching is not based on the transport mechanism being used and therefore, does not teach or suggest indexing the table with the transport mechanism, as claimed. For the foregoing reasons, Bennett fails to teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 1.

Moreover, the combination of Greer and Bennett do not teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 1 because Greer fails to remedy this deficiency in Bennett in that Greer fails to teach or suggest, “determining at least one parameter in a communication protocol by indexing a table with

the one transport mechanism, wherein said table comprises parameters that are designed to improve communication, based on the transport mechanisms," as claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert that Greer is silent as to issues related to improving communication based on the transport mechanisms.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that Greer fails to teach or suggest the claimed, "indexing the table with the transport mechanism," as Greer does not teach or suggest a table comprising the recited parameters. For the foregoing reasons, Greer and Bennett fail to teach or suggest this limitation.

Moreover, the combination of Greer, Solymar, and Bennett fail to teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 1 because Solymar fails to remedy the deficiencies in Greer and Bennett in that Solymar fails to teach or suggest, "determining at least one parameter in a communication protocol by indexing a table with the one transport mechanism, wherein said table comprises parameters that are designed to improve communication, based on the transport mechanisms," as claimed.

Applicants understand the rejection to assert that Solymar teaches that a different communication protocol might be used for wireless communication than for wireline communication. However, even if this is correct, Solymar is not concerned with *improving communication, based on*

a particular transport mechanism, as claimed. Moreover, Solymar does not teach or suggest, "indexing a table with the one transport mechanism," as claimed by Applicants.

For the foregoing rationale, the limitations of Claim 1 are neither taught nor suggested by Greer, Solymar, or Bennett, alone or in combination. As such, allowance of Claim 1 is respectfully solicited.

Claims 2-8 depend from Claim 1, which is believed to be allowable for the foregoing rationale. As such, it is respectfully asserted that the rejection of Claims 2-8 has been overcome and their allowance is earnestly solicited.

Claim 9 recites, in part:

e) said host computer system also operable to determine a communication protocol from a plurality of communication protocols based on said transport mechanism used, wherein said host computer system comprises a table defining a communication protocol having a plurality of parameters for each of the transport mechanisms, wherein like parameters for different transport mechanisms are separately adjustable to adapt each communication protocol to a respective transport mechanism.

Applicants have claimed that the table has a communication protocol for each of the transport mechanism. Like parameters for different transport mechanisms are separately adjustable to adapt each communication protocol to a respective transport mechanism. Thus, for example, a data encryption parameter may exist in a first communication protocol for an Infra Red

transport mechanism and a second communication protocol for a serial transport mechanism. The data encryption parameter is separately adjustable to adapt the first communication protocol to the Infra Red transport mechanism and the second communication protocol to the serial transport mechanism.

The rejection asserts that Bennett teaches a protocol logic subsystem that verifies an IP header checksum and sends a datagram over a bus 43, protocol logic 45, bus 49, i900 bridge 407, bus 47, bus interface 37, and PCI bus 40 (see e.g., Fig. 4). However, this disclosure of Bennett does not teach or suggest a table defining a communication protocol having a plurality of parameters for each of the transport mechanisms, as claimed. For example, Bennett fails to teach or suggest a table that comprises parameters for the various busses, logic, and interface.

Further, Bennett fails to teach or suggest like parameters in different communication protocols are separately adjustable to adapt each communication protocol to a respective transport mechanism, as claimed. For example, if the PCI bus 40 and the bus 43 are taken to be two different transport mechanisms, as the rejection appears to assert, Bennett is silent as to separately adapting a parameter in a communication protocol to the PCI bus 40 and the bus 43, for example. That is, Bennett does not teach or suggest a table with the separately adjustable parameters, as claimed.

Further, Bennett may teach verifying that the IP header checksum is correct and sending or not sending the datagram based on the verifying. However, this teaching is not based on the transport mechanism being used and therefore, does not teach or suggest the claimed limitations.

For the foregoing reasons, Bennett fails to teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 9.

Moreover, the combination of Greer and Bennett do not teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 9 because Greer fails to remedy this deficiency in Bennett. As Applicants have previously discussed, Greer is silent as to related to adapting to different transport mechanisms. Further, Greer fails to teach or suggest the claimed table. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that Greer fails to teach or suggest the claimed, "table with *like parameters in different communication protocols separately adjustable to adapt each communication protocol to a respective transport mechanism.*"

Moreover, the combination of Greer, Solymar, and Bennett fail to teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 9 because Solymar fails to remedy the deficiencies in Greer and Bennett because Solymar fails to remedy this deficiency in Greer in that Solymar fails to teach or suggest a, "table with *like parameters in different communication protocols separately adjustable to adapt each communication protocol to a respective transport mechanism,*" as claimed.

Applicants understand the rejection to assert that Solymar teaches that a different communication protocol might be used for wireless communication than for wireline communication. However, even if this is correct, Solymar does not teach or suggest the claimed table with like parameters in the different communication protocols are separately adjustable parameters to adapt each communication protocol to a respective transport mechanism.

For the foregoing rationale, the limitations of Claim 9 are neither taught nor suggested by Greer, Solymar or Bennett, alone or in combination. As such, allowance of Claim 9 is respectfully solicited.

Claims 10-18 depend from Claim 9, which is believed to be allowable for the foregoing rationale. As such, it is respectfully asserted that the rejection of Claims 10-18 has been overcome and their allowance is earnestly solicited.

Claim 19 recites, in part:

adaptation software residing on said host computer system, said adaptation software operable to determine a communication protocol from a plurality of communication protocols based on said one transport mechanism, wherein said adaptation software allows communication protocol parameters to be adjusted separately for each of the plurality of transport mechanisms.

For reasons discussed in the response to Claim 9, the above limitation is neither taught nor suggested by Greer, Solymar, or Bennett, alone or in combination. As such, allowance of Claim 19 is respectfully requested.

Claims 20-21 depend from Claim 19, which is believed to be allowable for the foregoing rationale. As such, it is respectfully asserted that the rejection of Claims 20-21 has been overcome and their allowance is earnestly solicited.


CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, reconsideration of the rejected Claims is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-21 overcome the rejections of record. Therefore, allowance of Claims 1-21 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant response, the Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Dated: 10/22, 2004

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP


Ronald M. Pomeranke
Registration No. 43,009

Address: WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
Telephone: (408) 938-9060 Voice
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile